



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## COMMUNICATION

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

Sir:

WHEN Professor John Bassett Moore's review of my *President's Control of Foreign Relations* appeared in the July issue of the *Review* I had not time to give it attention. It is not, however, I trust, too late to correct through your pages some of the misleading impressions it seems likely to leave with the reader of it.

(1) Professor Moore thinks that the Senate report dealing with President Cleveland's appointment of Commissioner Blount was somewhat evasive and inconclusive as a vindication.

This is a matter of construction. It seems entirely reasonable to hold that the significance of this report consists precisely in its assimilating the case of Blount, notwithstanding the large powers conferred upon him, with that of previous "personal agents", and especially since a minority of the committee dissented on the point which Professor Moore says was evaded.

(2) On page 83 of my volume I write: "The downfall of Huerta was due directly to President Wilson's failure to recognize him as the *de facto* government of Mexico." Professor Moore comments: "Huerta did not claim recognition as 'the *de facto* government of Mexico', but as constitutional president."

Either this criticism is irrelevant or it implies that the administration did recognize Huerta as the *de facto* government of Mexico. In the latter connection President Wilson's words, in his address of December 2, 1913, to Congress are not open to misconstruction:

"There can be no certain prospect of peace in America until General Huerta has surrendered his usurped authority in Mexico . . . Mexico has no government", etc. Nor did the administration later alter its attitude on this question.

(3) Professor Moore takes exception to my remark that "the power of Congress to declare war" appears "in actual exercise" to have been "the power to recognize an existing state of war", a power belonging also to the President "at least in the case of invasion or insurrection". He says: "A diminution of the power of Congress or an enlargement of that of the President, is not to be inferred from verbal jockeying for diplomatic advantage in the international game."

The observation is true enough, but not pertinent to a discussion which has for its subject the *form* which congressional "declarations of war" have taken from the outset (p. 140).

(4) Professor Moore criticizes a version of the Koszta episode which I quote from an opinion of the Supreme Court as "inaccurate and misleading". I do not find that it is in the least misleading regarding the topic in connection with which it is quoted. See, moreover, Rhodes, I. 416-418.

Most of the remaining criticisms are of much the same character, involving to a great extent matters of interpretation and opinion. It is of course difficult to bring an argued refutation of such criticisms within available space or within the rules governing communications of this character.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.